



STATE OF WASHINGTON
DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY

3100 Port of Benton Blvd • Richland, WA 99352 • (509) 372-7950

May 20, 2008

RECEIVED
MAY 21 2008
EDMC

Ms. Shirley J. Olinger, Manager
Office of River Protection
United States Department of Energy
P.O. Box 450, MSIN: H6-60
Richland, Washington 99352

Re: *241-C-110 Tank Waste Retrieval Work Plan*, RPP-33116, Revision 1

Dear Ms. Olinger:

The Department of Ecology reviewed the referenced document. We evaluated this document with the intent to ensure and support safe design and operation of waste retrieval and the protection of the environment. Our comments are enclosed.

This letter gives you conditional approval to proceed with retrieval system construction. Final approval of this document is pending resolution of our comments and confirmation of the closed comments.

The United States Department of Energy-Office of River Protection (USDOE-ORP) failed to complete Milestone M-45-00B by September 30, 2006, and is now out of compliance with the Tri-Party Agreement. We will determine an appropriate response in light of this noncompliance. We expect USDOE-ORP to proceed with meeting the requirements of this milestone at the earliest date possible.

If there are any questions, contact me at 509-372-7914.

Sincerely,

Jeffery J. Lyon
Tank Waste Storage Project Manager
Nuclear Waste Program

nu/aa
Enclosure

cc: See next page



Ms. Shirley J. Olinger

May 20, 2008

Page 2

cc w/enc:

Keith Carpenter, CH2M

Moses Jaraysi, CH2M

Jeff Luke, CH2M

John Schofield, CH2M

Stuart Harris, CTUIR

Gabriel Bohnee, NPT

Russell Jim, YN

Susan Leckband, HAB

Ken Niles, ODOE

Administrative Record: 241-C

Environmental Portal

CH2M HILL Correspondence Control

USDOE-ORP Correspondence Control

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 1 of 15

Document Number(s)/Title(s)	Program/Project/Building Number	Reviewers	Organization/Group	Location/Phone
RPP-33116, Revision 1 C-110 TWRWP		Michelle Mandis Les Fort Beth Rochette Nancy Uziemblo Joe Caggiano Jeff Lyon	Nuclear Waste Program Cleanup Section	3100 Port of Benton Blvd Richland, WA 99354 (509) 372-7950

Comment Submittal Approval:

Agreement with indicated comment disposition(s):

Status:

Organization Manager (Optional)

Reviewer/Point of Contact

Reviewer/Point of Contact

Date

Date

Nancy Uziemblo

Author/Originator: Ecology

Author/Originator

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
1)	General Comment	Cyanide is present in tank C-110. Also, cyanide has been observed in groundwater near C-farm. Furthermore, cyanide is an anion, does not bind strongly to soils, and may leach to groundwater (http://www.epa.gov/safewater/dwh/c-ioc/cyanide.html). However, cyanide risk assessment results have not been provided in this TWRWP and the risk and hazard results in this TWRWP may be an underestimate of chemical hazards associated with these tanks and associated retrievals. This is further compounded by the lack of data on contaminants not included in the BBI (ex. Tributyl phosphate). These factors will need to be considered by Ecology during tank retrievals. This comment is for the record and does not require a			

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 2 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
		response from USDOE for this TWRWP.			
2)	Section 1.0	The reference to the TWRWP letter will be used in the TWRWP as guidance. This comment is for the record and does not require a response from USDOE for this TWRWP.			
3)	Section 2.0 General Section 2.1.4 Page 2-9	Numbers in bold added by CH2M HILL for clarity. 1) Discuss in this section the sampling and analysis of Tc-99 in the DST supernatant tank to be used for retrieval. 2) As with other tanks sluiced with supernatant, Ecology requires pre-retrieval analysis of Tc-99 in the feed solution, consistent with RPP-22393, Revision 2, Section 3.2. Please include the following text: "A chemical analysis of the technetium-99 in the supernatant of the receiving DST shall be obtained for DST samples taken during the retrieval process at the mid-point of retrieval. This value will be reported in the retrieval data report, and compared with (1) the currently estimated BBI concentration, and (2) estimated flow sheet changes in the supernatant technetium-99 concentration." 3) The White Paper (attachment #3) does not provide a sufficient justification to suspend sampling of 99Tc. It appears that you are using one data point as a basis and flow sheet information is not discussed. According to information provided in Appendix A, the Standard Deviation for the 99Tc in C-110 supernatant is two orders of magnitude higher than the inventory value.		1) Section 2, per the TWRWP Outline agreed to with Ecology in August 2004, is where information on the SST whose waste is being retrieved is required to be. Words on DST sampling for 99Tc have been added to Section 3.2. 2) See revised words added to Section 3.2. These words state a DST sample will be obtained if needed for 99Tc if C-110 leaks during retrieval, or, if a DST sample is required for other purposes a 99Tc analysis will be obtained. 3) The white paper has been revised to clarify the wording. The revised white paper is included with this RCR as Attachment #1. The point of the white paper is that if a C-110 leak occurs, a DST sample can be obtained following the leak. There is no benefit to taking a sample prior to the need, and not	Closed A pre-retrieval 99Tc sample is not necessary for this tank only due to previous sampling of C-110 and AN-106.

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 3 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
		<p>4) New Comment on 10/18/07 following meeting between Ecology, CH2M HILL and ORP. (following comment written by CH2M HILL based upon comment as understood)</p> <p>It must be verified that the Appendix B data for Tc-99 is still conservative for a C-110 retrieval leak because the AN-106 Tc-99 composition used for the</p>		<p>obtaining a sample until it is needed will have no impact on the ability to analyze the DST sample for 99Tc.</p> <p>Regarding the comment that the white paper was based on one data point, the white paper states that the last DST sample closely matched the expected DST concentration. The expected DST concentration was based upon mixing of SST 99Tc with the DST 99Tc. The DST 99Tc was based upon previous DST samples and the SST 99Tc was based upon the BBI.</p> <p>The quantity of 99Tc in the AN-106 supernate is >250 times the quantity in the C-110 supernate, and the relative standard deviation for the C-110 supernate 99Tc concentration is 16.9, not two orders of magnitude. Any variation in the C-110 supernate 99Tc concentration from that given in Appendix A within the limits of the relative standard deviation will have negligible impact on the DST supernate 99Tc concentration.</p> <p>4) Five AN-106 samples were taken in May of 2007 from different heights in the tank and were 0.0159, 0.0174, 0.0197, 0.0177 and 0.0167 $\mu\text{Ci/mL}$. The average is 0.0175 $\mu\text{Ci per mL}$. Allowing for the receipt of the remaining heel in C-108, and all of C-109 and C-110, the AN-106 supernate concentration calculates to be</p>	

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 4 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
		risk calculations in RPP-33116 Rev 0A was based on AN-106 samples from May 2006, while most of the supernate in AN-106 was later transferred out in the fall of 2006 and replaced with supernate from another DST.		0.0475 µCi/mL. The risk calculations in Appendix B were based upon an estimated 99Tc concentration of 0.0477 µCi/mL, or almost exactly the same number, so no change will be made to the Appendix B risk calcs for 99Tc.	
4)	Section 2.1.1	<p>Ecology would like to continue to receive the major schedule elements such as design, construction, and field retrieval activities (that are to be included with the TWRWP as addressed in Appendix I) in the monthly Tri-Party Agreement Manager Milestone Review Meetings.</p> <p>This comment is for the record and does not require a response from USDOE for this TWRWP.</p>			
5)	Section 2.1.2 and 3.8	<p>Reference the IQRPE Decision Logic for Equipment Repair, Maintenance, or Replacement/Instillation as described in RPP-16922, Latest Revision.</p> <p>Any modification to the system "requires" an IQRPE for this retrieval system since it is essentially an extension of the DST System.</p> <p>Furthermore, the central caisson design is being modified from its original design and therefore "must" be certified by an IQRPE in accordance with the WAC regulations. There is no past integrity assessments to certify that the center corrugated caisson can be used for secondary-containment. Also, provide the same information for existing risers and pits that are to be used during the waste retrieval operation.</p> <p>Therefore, central caisson, risers and pits that are used during the retrieval are part of the retrieval system and require an IQRPE assessment and certification.</p>			
6)	Section 2.1.3.2	Address that the process control waste level limit on waste depth will be established during the PCP as stated in sections 3.1.2 and 4.6.1.			

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 5 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
		Requested editorial change.			
7)	Section 2.1.4 Page 2-8 b.	<p>Include the following text in "b": "The BBI is the best available data; however, the information and the risk and hazard values derived from the BBI are insufficient for closure."</p> <p>The uncertainty in the inventories is large (some standard deviations exceed the actual inventory values and many are not reported). Consequently, it is not demonstrated that the contaminants contributing 95% of the risk have been properly identified.</p>		<p>Per Appendix I of the HFFACO, the requested addition is not applicable to a TWRWP. Appendix I, of the HFFACO, in Section 2.1.3 states, "TWRWPs will address only those actions associated with waste retrieval."</p> <p>Added words to 2.1.4 saying, "The information on risk and hazard values for future closure actions will be derived from post-retrieval sampling."</p>	Closed
8)	Section 2.1.4	Please discuss the historic heat load of the tank. The tank does contain organic wash waste, and Ecology has concerns that a significant amount of waste may remain on the walls and stiffener rings.		<p>Attachment #2 is a plot of the C-110 temperature since 1991. This is as far back as the SACS data from the TWINS database goes for this tank. The plot shows the temperature has been essentially ambient since 1991.</p> <p>It is unnecessary to go back to stored data records to get earlier temperature data for several reasons. First, the lack of any significant temperature decrease in the plot shows there is a relatively low level of heat producing radionuclides present, so the temperature would not have been significantly higher in the past since Sr-90 (predominant heat generating sludge radionuclide) has a half life of about 29 years. This means the heat generation rate from Sr-90 in 1952 when the addition of heat producing sludge was completed would have been about 2.6 times what it was in 1991. Second, Figure 2-3 shows the surface and sludge level history. The vast majority of sludge was added between 1946 and 1952 when 1-C waste, the</p>	Closed

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 6 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
				<p>first cycle waste from bismuth phosphate processing, was added to the tank. Several hundred thousand gal of OWW waste was added to the tank in 1956, but sludge level data show no solids increase. The OWW liquid was subsequently pumped out of the tank. The OWW stream from Purex was a low level stream, containing less than 1% of the fission products in the dissolved fuel. It was a combination of two waste streams, both dilute Na_2CO_3-KMnO_4 mixtures used to wash the two plant organic systems, one of which was contained in a cell routinely entered by personnel. Thus, the heat generating potential of this stream was low.</p> <p>The heat load in C-110 has been low in this tank compared to tanks that received more concentrated first cycle wastes.</p>	
9)	Section 3.1.1 Page 3-2 Table 3-1	Explain the planned uses for risers #8 and 5.		The use of these risers is shown in revised Table 3-1 in RPP-33116 Revision 1.	Closed
10)	Section 3.1.1	State how the associated ancillary DST System equipment, including such elements as the C-110 corrugated caisson and associated risers, will be certified as compliant as a secondary containment structures.			
11)	Section 3.1.1	Provide the timeline for the required shut down of the C-110 transfer pump and the receiver DST pump and how that will ensure that the portable valve box or any other piece of ancillary transfer equipment will not overflow the secondary containment structure. This is a performance measure and needs to be part of the work plan.			
12)	Section 3.1.1 Page 3-1	According to the regulations, any new piece of equipment requires an IA assessment and must address the impacts that the piece of equipment will have on the existing tank system. Therefore, provide all past		See revised wording in section 3.8. All new or used transfer SSCs, including secondary containment and LD equipment will be included with the design provided to the	Closed

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 7 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
		integrity assessments done to certify that the center corrugated caisson can be used for secondary-containment consistent with 40 CFR 265.192.		IQRPE for review.	
13)	Section 3.1.2	First paragraph on page 3-5. Level measurement has not been found to be the best measurement. It is easiest and readily available, but not proven to be the best. Remove the word "best." Requested editorial change.			
14)	Section 3.1.2 Page 3-6	Provide a discussion of HFFACO Appendix I requirement (page I-6) for completing retrieval within 12 months of start date. Please include a timeline that indicates how the operator will meet the requirement to complete retrieval, and what process will be used to inform Ecology that this date and timeline will need change. Appendix I, section 2.1.5, Waste retrieval, page I-6 "...DOE will complete SST waste retrieval activities meeting Agreement criteria of ..M-45... and ancillary equipment waste retrieval activities meeting regulatory requirements, within 12 months of the retrieval start date(s) approved in the TWRWP."		Accepted. Added words to 2.1.1 stating retrieval will be completed within the time specified in the work plan or the work plan will be modified to provide an estimated completion date for the process.	Closed
15)	Section 3.2 Page 3-6 Table 3-2	Provide the document/calculation reference for information provided in the table		There are 3 references given for the 4 numbers stated in the table. Ref (a) says the 178 kgal value is from Table 2-3. Going to Table 2-3 the reference for 177,000 gal of solids and 1,060 gal of supernate is stated at the bottom of the table with the TWINS download reference. There is no calculation to reference, $177,000+1,060=178,060$ which is rounded off to 178 kgal in Table 3-2. References are added for the Ref (b) statement that the 105 kgal flush is the same as other 100 series modified sluicing tanks.	Closed

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 8 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
				Ref (c) is for the estimated supernate volume and operating duration days. There is no formal calc note for these numbers, they are estimates only, the basis for which is explained in the footnote to Table 3-2. For clarity, Attachment #3 to this RCR provides the calculations supporting the Table 3-2 values. Minor change made to the supernate value in Table 3-2.	
16)	Section 3.4 Page 3-10	HFFACO Milestone M-45-00 states that "...as much tank waste as technically possible..." Not technically practical. Please correct this statement.		Change made as requested.	Closed
17)	Section 3.7 Page 3-17	A performance measure for the potential intrusion of rainwater or snowfall will need to be considered and discussed. With closure delays of more than 10 years, additional monitoring may be necessary. Please include the plans and basis for additional monitoring.		See wording at the end of Section 6.3, which addresses post retrieval intrusion monitoring.	Closed
18)	Section 3.8 Page 3-17	IQRPE integrity assessment must also address potential impacts on existing tank systems used as secondary containment (as an example the corrugated caissons, portable valve boxes). Please provide that assessment.		Partially accepted. See revised wording in section 3.8. All new or used transfer SSCs, including secondary containment and LD equipment will be included with the design provided to the IQRPE for review.	Closed
19)	Section 3.9.1	Provide such information in the form of "in accordance with the HIHTL Management Plan" or some other specific performance measure.		Provision of a timeline for removal of above grade equipment is not possible at this time because design has not been initiated for all future retrievals nor is there an agreed to closure plan for C-Farm. Equipment that needs to be removed, excluding HIHTLs, and is not suitable for reuse will be packaged and disposed of onsite in accordance with the approved waste acceptance criteria for the Hanford Site burial grounds.	Closed
20)	Section 3.9.1	State how the HIHTL will be managed. Ecology expects the current HIHTL Management Plan will be used to manage all HIHTLs. Address this in this section.		Accepted. Wording added to Section 3.9.1 stating the HIHTLs will be managed in accordance with RPP-12711.	Closed
21)	Section 3.9.1 Page 3-18	Numbers in bold added by CH2M HILL for clarity. Description does not clearly indicate the disposition of			Not closed

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 9 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
		<p>the new WRS components. Provide a timeline for when above ground equipment is to be removed, or if to be reused, transitioned.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Please provide sufficient detail to allow us to understand what the major disposal disposition categories of equipment, 2) what Hanford Site burial grounds are being used, 3) what process will be used for the management of the HIHTLs, 4) If any above ground equipment is anticipated to be left in place. 5) Provide a plan within 30 days from the end of retrieval that indicates the date of removal for all recently installed above ground equipment not planned for reuse, and a list and plan for equipment for that is scheduled for future use. For the recently installed above ground equipment that 		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Accepted. Added words to 3.9.1 that contaminated retrieval process equipment not reused will be disposed of as mixed waste. 2) Partially accepted. Once the waste is packaged to meet land disposal restrictions it will be disposed of in a mixed waste trench in the 200 West Area, possibly Trench #34, but this cannot be determined at this time. 3) Accepted. See response to Comment above for wording change on HIHTL handling. 4) Partially accepted. Most all above ground equipment will be left in place to be used either for future tank retrievals or for use during closure. This includes, but isn't limited to, aboveground diversion boxes, exhausters, skids, hydraulic equipment, and exhauster ducting. HIHTLs will be left in place to the limits established in RPP-12711. Most major aboveground equipment won't be removed until a final closure plan is agreed to for the C-Farm tanks. 	

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008
Project No.

Review No.
Final comments
Page 10 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
		does not have a use within this farm, the equipment must be removed within 1 year after the end of retrieval.			
6)	Section 4.0	<p>HRR must be fully implemented before retrieval operations can be initiated. USDOE must re-write and propose modifications to LDMM conditions in Chapter 4 within 90 days. These changes must be approved and implemented prior to initiation of waste removal.</p> <p>The TWRWP must list the HRR system as fully implemented [including administratively and training-wise] when C-110 retrieval starts</p> <p>When HRR is fully administratively and physically implemented, the following will also occur:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Groundwater wells will be sampled quarterly 2) Dry well monitoring pre-retrieval will be with gamma and moisture measurements 3) Dry Well monitoring post-retrieval will be gamma measurements 4) Dry Well monitoring with moisture measurements will be conducted as a backup means of leak detection if the HRR system becomes inoperable. 			
7)	Section 4.1.2.2 Page 4-3	Drywells extend only into a part of the vadose zone, not to the water table. Therefore, groundwater samples can not be collected from drywells. Please correct.		Changed "drywells" to "groundwater monitoring wells"	Closed
8)	Section 4.2.1.1	<p>Numbers in bold added by CH2M HILL for clarity.</p> <p>In this section, you discuss the capabilities of the measurement systems for leak detection and their detection limits.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Please discuss the minimum tank volume and 		1) Not accepted.	Closed

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008
Project No.

Review No.
Final comments
Page 11 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
		<p>2) Cesium concentration required to show an increase in counts above background.</p> <p>3) Please discuss the calculated travel time for a leak of this size to show up in the drywell.</p>		<p>2) There is no minimum calculated tank volume available that will show an increase in drywell counts above background outside this 300-18,000 gal (or above) range.</p> <p>3) Section 4.2.1.1 discusses drywell monitoring and how it is used for leak detection. The performance capability of drywell monitoring is discussed in Section 4.5.1, in accordance with the August 2004 TWRWP outline.</p> <p>4) Excerpts from RPP-10413 on drywell monitoring performance have been added to 4.5.1 following discussion with Ecology on 12/5/07 concerning the performance of drywell monitoring.</p> <p>No minimum ¹³⁷Cs concentration can be stated to ensure a leak is detected in a drywell. Moisture logging doesn't use the gamma concentration in the waste to spot a leak, only the moisture level. An unexplained increase in the moisture level would then be evaluated by gamma logging. A leak would likely have to get within 2-3 feet of the drywell before an increase in radiation was noted. To estimate a specific ¹³⁷Cs concentration required to show an increase would require making too many assumptions and provide no useful information. A major complication is some of the ¹³⁷Cs in the waste will be absorbed in the soil</p>	

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 12 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
				<p>around the tank, depending upon the ion exchange properties of the soil. Thus regardless of the initial waste concentration, the ¹³⁷Cs concentration will be reduced as it travels toward the drywell.</p> <p>Provided to Ecology with this RCR response is Attachment #4, a copy of RPP-10413, (provided on 10/18/07) which provided a Monte Carlo analysis of numerous variables and their impact on drywell monitoring. The travel time to detection will vary widely dependent upon the variables assumed, including the tank leak rate.</p> <p>5) Key excerpts from RPP-10413 have been included in Section 4.5.1 in response to Ecology comments on drywell monitoring performance in a meeting on 12/5/07.</p>	
9)	Section 4.2.1.1 Page 4-7 Paragraph 7	Reporting of the drywell logging data in the RDR is not timely and therefore not useful for LDMM. State the timing for analysis and availability of the data via HLAN. While it is valuable information, timelier reporting is needed if there are unexplained anomalies detected. Please correct.		<p>This paragraph was put in previous TWRWPs at the request of Ecology. It repeats wording in Appendix I as to what goes in the RDR.</p> <p>There is no statement in the TWRWP that the reporting of drywell logging in the RDR is used for LDMM. The timeliness of drywell logging data for LDMM is discussed in the last paragraph of Section 4.5.1. This information is recorded, reviewed, and plotted and the data are available on a share drive, it is not directly accessible to everyone on HLAN.</p>	Closed
10)	Section 4.2.1.2 Page 4-8	The timing of notification to Ecology needs to be specified. Ecology expects notification within a 72 hour		Not accepted. The paragraph commented on discusses "informing" Ecology of an	Closed

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 13 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
	Paragraph 5	time period or sooner. Please clarify.		unexplained HRR anomaly. This paragraph was put in previous TWRWPs at the request of Ecology, as they desired to be made aware of the fact that a review may be underway for a potential leak resulting from HRR data. Ecology will be notified of a confirmed leak in accordance with Section 4.6.	
11)	Section 4.4, Table 4.1	While the tanks are using interim status requirements, they are considered part of the Hanford Site Wide Permit as units undergoing closure. Under the current set of circumstances, portions of the SST system will be non-compliant. Retrieval is considered part of the closure actions. It is also acknowledged that the new installations will be compliant with final status regulations. For table 4.1 and any other references related to this issue, please indicate that the above ground systems and any other new systems installed as part of the WRS, will comply with WAC 173-303-640. Any below grade existing system may operate under 40 CFR 265.193, DOE Order 435.1, and the basis provided.			
12)	Section 4.6.1	Please state the maximum current waste level and the maximum benchmark level for controlling liquid additions. Define the meaning of "as close to."		Partially accepted. See revised wording in Section 4.6.1.e. Following discussion with Ecology on 12/19/07 the wording has again been revised to state the benchmark is provided in the PCP, with added words that it is based upon minimizing liquid in the tank.	Not closed Ecology is concerned that the TWRWP no longer has identified limitations on liquid levels within the tank undergoing retrieval. We believe that these should be identified and subject to our approval. Currently USDOE has deferred these limitations to a document which we do not approve. Delete the 8 th bullet in the first set of bullets and replace with the appropriate wording

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 14 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
					that was used in Rev 0. Include the maximum, the goal, the benchmark definition in the PCP, and on minimizing the liquid in the tank.
13)	Section 5 Page 5-5	<p>Add the following text under the Compliance Method column for 265.191 – “Assessment of existing tank systems.”</p> <p>The SST Integrity Assessment Report concluded that the reinforced concrete tank structures have adequate collapse margin and justify safe storage of interim stabilized waste. However, given the tank leak history and current conditions of tank liners, long-term leak integrity, for the liquids remaining in tanks, cannot be proven for any SSTs. Therefore,</p> <p>The SSTs are not compliant with RCRA 40 CFR 265.191. The SSTs are currently authorized to continue operations pending closure under the authority of the HFFACO milestone M-45-00.</p>		Partially accepted. The following change has been made to item “d.” in the table: “Because the SSTs are not compliant with RCRA 40 CFR 265.191, the SSTs are currently authorized to continue operations pending closure under the authority of the HFFACO milestone M-45-00.”	Closed
14)	Section 6.3	Provide a timeline for when the transfer lines are to be disconnected and capped; as well as the previously isolated intrusion routes, etc.		Accepted. The wording in Section 6.3 has been modified to clarify the timing for disconnection and capping of joints and previously isolated intrusion routes, and that HIHTLs are handled as stated in 3.9.1.	Closed
15)	Section 7.1.1.3 Page 7-9 1 st paragraph of section	A statement in previous TWRWPs has been omitted here. The statement was “The groundwater contaminant concentrations used for retrieval leak impact graphs were derived directly from the modeling output data from RPP-13774 analysis.” Has this condition changed? If so, please explain the source of the groundwater contaminant concentrations used in the retrieval leak impact graphs. If it has not changed, please include the statement.		<p>Accepted.</p> <p>Yes, the concentration source for the C-110 values is changed. The last paragraph in section 7.1.1.2 gives the reference, it is RPP-22521. This change was necessary due to the change from vacuum/MRS retrieval to modified sluicing retrieval for C-110. RPP-22521, Appendix A estimates the DST supernate concentrations based upon the</p>	<p>Not closed</p> <p>The disposition needs to be changed to cite Revision 3 of RPP-22521.</p>

REVIEW COMMENT RECORD

Date
5/7/2008

Review No.
Final comments

Project No.

Page 15 of 15

Item	Page #	Comment	Hold Point	Disposition (Provide justification if NOT accepted)	Status
				addition of retrieved waste from all other SSTs scheduled to be added to the DST before, and including, the C-110 waste. Additional explanatory wording has been added to 7.1.1.3.	
16)	Section 7 Page 7-2 2 nd to last paragraph	This is new text not used in previous TWRWPs. Please delete "Use of RPP-13774 in this document was discussed with, and agreed to informally, by Ecology prior to developing this TWRWP." Ecology still has unresolved comments from the original review of RPP-13774 and continues to expect additional data that have not been included in this document (for instance, nearby unplanned release inventories, direct contact evaluations, ecological risk assessment results, etc).		Sentence deleted as requested.	Closed
17)	Appendix B, p. B-4, Table B-1 and Section B2.3, 3rd paragraph	Please add text in section B2.2 indicating that the supernatant concentrations of the contaminants in Table B-1 have been revised since Revision 0 as a result of new supernatant sample results from AN-106. Also, mention in the text any changes in retrieval sequence that may have occurred after the release of Rev. 0 of RPP-33116.			